

STATINTL

## Supporters of U.S. Dominican Stance Lower Boom on Fulbright's Criticism

By John M. Goshko  
Washington Post Staff Writer

Sen. J. William Fulbright's characterization of the Dominican Republic intervention as a "grievous mistake" came under heavy attack yesterday by Sen. Thomas J. Dodd (D-Conn.), who called the U. S. action an "unavoidable necessity."

In a lengthy Senate speech, Dodd charged that Fulbright, chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, had ignored a mass of evidence supporting the correctness of President Johnson's dispatch of troops to Santo Domingo last April.

Dodd's speech was the principal thrust in a multi-pronged counterattack that pro-Administration figures began mounting against Fulbright yesterday.

On Wednesday, Fulbright (D-Ark.) charged that the U.S. intervention had resulted from a panicky overestimation of Communist strength among the Dominican rebels, had placed the United States on the side of right-wing forces and had thus damaged U.S. prestige among progressive forces in Latin America.

Most of the resultant furor that sprang up yesterday was centered on Capitol Hill — and most of it was directed against Fulbright. Among those defending the Administration were Senate Republi-

can Leader Everett M. Dirksen of Illinois, House Republican Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan, Sen. Russell B. Long (D-La.), Sen. George A. Smathers (D-Fla.) and Sen. Clifford P. Case (R-N.J.).

Backing for Fulbright came from Sen. Joseph S. Clark (D-Pa.), who found Fulbright's views "overdue, sound and wise," and Sen. Wayne Morse (D-Ore.), who supported Fulbright "100 per cent."

Within the Administration itself, most officials took a flat "no comment" position. Privately, however, they made no secret of their anger at Fulbright and implied that Dodd's reply had the tacit blessing of the Administration.

The sole exception to this "no comment" stance was Defense Secretary Robert S. McNamara, who described Fulbright's criticism of U.S. Ambassador W. Tapley Bennett as "an unfair attack on a very dedicated and very able foreign service officer."

McNamara also said there was "no question in my mind" that U.S. citizens in the Dominican Republic had been endangered by the revolution. But he did not answer Fulbright's assertion that U.S. officials had overestimated the Communist threat.

Dodd, a close friend of President Johnson, charged Fulbright with a "tolerance of communism" and said he "suf-

fers from an indiscriminate infatuation with revolutions of all kinds, national, democratic or Communist."

The Connecticut Senator agreed with Fulbright that the United States cannot beat communism by siding with rightist elements in Latin America and that the "best hope for the future . . . lies with the parties of the so-called democratic left."

However, he argued, the situation in the Dominican Republic, when judged by any criteria, showed a danger of a Communist take over and required direct action.

To buttress this contention, Dodd cited State Department estimates of Communist strength within the rebel leadership, the views of John Bartlow Martin, former U.S. ambassador in Santo Domingo, and the report of a five-member Organization of American States Commission that visited Santo Domingo shortly after the U.S. intervention.

The OAS Commission's report stated that Santo Domingo was in a state of anarchy in the days after the revolution's outbreak and that the rebel ranks included several pro-Castro figures. However, the report does not state outright that the rebel movement was Communist-controlled; and there has been considerable controversy about whether the Commission intended to imply that it was.